IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:-

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.H.L.DATTU
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.T.SANKARAN

TUESDAY, THE 26TH JUNE 2007 / 5TH ASHADHA 1929

Cont.Case(C).No.1346 of 2006(S)

ARISING FROM THE JUDGEMENT IN O.P.NO.14198/1996-M DATED 29.7.2005

.....

PETITIONER:-

S.RAMAKRISHNAN,
DEPUTY TAHSILDAR (RETIRED), (PLANTATION TAX),
KOTHAMANGALAM.

BY ADV. SMT.I.SHEELA DEVI.

RESPONDENT:-

NIVEDITHA P.HARAN,
(FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER,
AGED NOT KNOWN), NOW WORKING AS COMMISSIONER,
LAND REVENUE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY SENIOR GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.M.R.SABU.

THIS CONTEMPT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 26/06/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:-

H.L.Dattu,C.J. & K.T.Sankaran,J.

Cont.Case (C).No.1346 of 2006-S

Dated, this the 26th day of June, 2007

JUDGMENT

H.L.Dattu,C.J.

This Court while disposing of O.P.No.14198 of 1996 dated 29.07.2005 had directed the respondents to reconsider the representation - Exhibit P2 - in the light of the observations made in the course of the order.

2. After the disposal of the Original Petition, the respondents, after reconsidering the representation (Exhibit P2) filed by the petitioner, has passed an order dated 16.06.2006.

3. As we have already stated, the direction that was issued was to reconsider the representation (Exhibit P2) and that has been done and an order has been issued. If for any reason the petitioner is aggrieved, necessarily the petitioner has to question the same before this Court. In that view of the matter, we do not intend to take cognizance of the contempt petition filed by the complainant. Therefore, the contempt petition requires to be rejected and it is rejected.

Ordered accordingly.

H.L.Dattu
Chief Justice

K.T.Sankaran
Judge

vku/-